

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/711,393	09/16/2004	Tzu-Kan Chen	09670-US-PA	5392	
31561	7590 07/25/2005		EXAMINER		
JIANO CHYUN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OFFICE			DINH, JACK		
7 FLOOR-1, 1	NO. 100 ROAD, SECTION 2		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
TAIPEI, 100			2873		
TAIWAN			DATE MAILED: 07/25/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		·	V
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/711,393	CHEN, TZU-KAN	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jack Dinh	2873	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	e correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the main earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	1. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be eply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) of will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS froute, cause the application to become ABANDOI	timely filed lays will be considered timely. om the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status		·	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16	September 2004.		
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ The	nis action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	vance except for formal matters, p	prosecution as to the merits is	_
closed in accordance with the practice unde	r <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11,	453 O.G. 213.	,
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application	on.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	l/or election requirement.		
Application Papers	·		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exami	ner.		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 16 September 2004 i		ected to by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	ne drawing(s) be held in abeyance. S	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	ection is required if the drawing(s) is	objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached Office	ce Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	,		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	an priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	(a)-(d) or (f)	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	gir priority amade do dicio. 5 1 10	(4) (4) 0, (1).	
1. Certified copies of the priority docume	nts have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority docume		ation No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pr	iority documents have been rece	ived in this National Stage	
application from the International Bure	eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a li	st of the certified copies not recei	ved.	
·			
Attachment(s)		•	
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summa		
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 	Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informa	Date I Patent Application (PTO-152)	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other: <u>DETAILED</u>		

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

Figures 1 and 2 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 3-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 3, the phrase "concave surface" lacks antecedent basis.

-

Page 3

Regarding claims 4-7, the phrase "aspheric lens" renders the claim indefinite. Since both lenses are aspheric, it is unclear which aspheric lens is being referred to. For examination purpose, the rejections below are based on the broadest possible interpretation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi et al. (US Patent 6,885,508) in view of Nakajoh (US Patent 2003/0025826).

Regarding claim 1, Yamaguchi (figure 2) is interpreted as disclosing an optical image device, suitable for capturing an image of an object comprising a lens module, having a molded glass (col. 4, lines 36-48) aspheric lens L1 and one aspheric lens L2, the molded glass aspheric lens is located at one side near the object, an infrared cut coating G (figure 7), an image sensor 51, disposed at back of the lens module to capture the image of the object. Yamaguchi is interpreted as disclosing all the claimed limitations except that the infrared cut coating is formed on the molded glass aspheric lens. Within the same field of endeavor, Nakajoh (figure 2) is interpreted as disclosing the teaching of an infrared cut coating 16B formed on the surface of the lens 16A. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

Art Unit: 2873

invention was made to apply the infrared cut coating on the molded glass aspheric lens, for the purpose of cutting off infrared rays and decreasing the influence of infrared rays on image.

Regarding claim 2, Yamaguchi is interpreted as further disclosing that the molded glass aspheric lens includes a meniscus lens with a convex surface facing to the object (col. 1, lines 52-55).

Regarding claim 3, Yamaguchi in view of Nakajoh is interpreted as disclosing all the claimed limitations, as described above except that the IR cut coating is formed on the concave surface. However, the device comprises only two lenses. With a total of 4 surfaces from the two lenses, the possible choices in placing the IR coating on one of the surfaces is very limited, which can be easily found by experimentation. It is considered not inventive to discover the optimal condition by experimentation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the infrared cut coating on the concave surface, or perhaps other lens surfaces, for the purpose of cutting off infrared rays and decreasing the influence of infrared rays on image.

Regarding claim 4, Yamaguchi is interpreted as further disclosing that the aspheric lens includes an aspheric meniscus lens (col. 1, lines 51-58).

Regarding claims 5 and 6, Yamaguchi is interpreted as further disclosing that the aspheric lens includes a plastic lens or a glass-molding lens (col. 4, lines 36-48).

Art Unit: 2873

Regarding claim 7, Yamaguchi is interpreted as further disclosing that the aspheric lens has a positive focal length (col. 1, lines 51-58).

Regarding claim 9, Yamaguchi (figure 7) is interpreted as further disclosing that the lens module has a stop S located between the molded glass aspheric lens and the object.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi et al. (US Patent 6,885,508) in view of Nakajoh (US Patent 2003/0025826), as applied in claim 1, and further in view of Jo et al. (US Patent 6,853,504).

Regarding claim 8, Yamaguchi in view of Hakajoh is interpreted as disclosing all the claimed limitations, as described above except that the stop is located between the first and second lens. Within the same field of endeavor, Jo (figure 2) is interpreted as disclosing an imaging device comprises two lenses wherein a stop is located between the lenses. Furthermore, in simple lens system such as claimed, there are very few positions where the stop can be placed. All of which are obvious to one skilled in the art and can be experimented depending on the quantity of light needed for specific application. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to position the stop between the first and second lens for the purpose of adjusting the quantity of light.

Art Unit: 2873

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi et al. (US Patent 6,885,508) in view of Nakajoh (US Patent 2003/0025826), as applied in claim 1, and further in view of the Applicant's admitted prior art.

Regarding claim 8, Yamaguchi in view of Hakajoh is interpreted as disclosing all the claimed limitations, as described above except for the cover glass formed on the imaged sensor. Within the same field of endeavor, the Applicant's admitted prior art (figure 2) is interpreted as disclosing a cover glass 108 formed on the image sensor 104. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a cover glass for the purpose of covering the image sensor from the lens mechanism.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jack Dinh whose telephone number is 571-272-2327. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30 AM - 6:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Georgia Y. Epps can be reached on 571-272-2328. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/711,393

Art Unit: 2873

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jack Dinh

Georgial Epps
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800

Page 7